

REMARKS

Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment and the accompanying IDS should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 9-14

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 9-14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama (US 2001/0002703) in view of Himeshima et al. (JP 09-235546). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite several additional features. In particular, Claim 1 recites the feature of a photosensitive organic resin film. The photosensitive organic resin film (see e.g. reference numeral 126 in Fig. 3 of the present application) has an opening and is in contact with the light-emitting layer (e.g. reference numeral 122).

Applicants have also amended Claim 1 with regard to the shape of the photosensitive organic resin film. For example, the claim recites that an angle of an interface between the photosensitive organic resin film and the light-emitting layer to the anode sequentially varies. This is done to provide a roundish shape. In particular, the

passivation film comprising inorganic materials generally has very high stress and traction, which results in stress on the light-emitting layer. Thus, it is preferable that the interlayer between the light-emitting layer and the photosensitive organic resin film possesses a roundish shape, which can reduce the stress on the light-emitting layer and avoid the formation of a defect called a shrink. These features are supported in the specification at, for example, page 8, line 29 - page 9, line 17 and Fig. 3 of the present application.

In contrast, Koyama and Himeshima do not disclose or suggest a photosensitive organic resin film in which the angle of the interface between the photosensitive organic resin film and the light-emitting layer to the anode sequentially varies. For example, in Koyama, any such angle varies discontinuously (see e.g., for contrast, Fig. 3 in the present application and numerals 44a and 44b in Fig. 11 of Koyama).

Therefore, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 1, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 9-14

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 9-14 [sic 8-14] under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US 2002/0070385) in view of Koyama and Himeshima et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 2 in a manner similar to that discussed above for independent Claim 1.

As the Examiner admits, Yamagata does not appear to disclose many of the claimed features of Claim 2. Yamagata also does not appear to disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of Claim 1 that are also in Claim 2. As explained above, neither Koyama nor Himeshima disclose or suggest these claimed features.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent Claim 2 is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

In addition, Applicants are amending Claim 2 to add a further feature regarding the structure of the light-emitting layer. In particular, Claim 2 now recites that the light-emitting layer comprises copper phthalocyanine and calcium fluoride. This feature is supported by, for example, embodiment 1 in the specification. It is well-known that the most appropriate concentration of dopant is frequently and drastically influenced by the carrier-injection balance and the carrier-injection balance strongly depends on the carrier injection materials. However, it is quite difficult, and not merely a matter of routine experimentation, to predict the best dopant-concentration when the device structure as well as the materials used are changed and/or different than before. As shown in the present application, Applicants believe the claimed concentration to be advantageous. There is no teaching or suggestion in Himeshima, Yamagata, or Koyama that a light-emitting device having the structure recited in Claim 2 exhibits a better performance at the concentration disclosed in the present application and claimed herein. Hence, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the cited references of this claimed feature.

Accordingly, independent Claim 2 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3

The Examiner also rejects Claim 3 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US Publ 2002/0074936). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Claim 3 has been amended to correct a grammatical error.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4

The Examiner also rejects Claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,359,320). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5

The Examiner also rejects Claim 5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Tamai et al. (US 5,793,497). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6

The Examiner also rejects Claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himeshima et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of *Producing Monolithic Light Emitting Diode Display Chips* (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 16, Issue 1, Pg. 6, 6/1/1973). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7

The Examiner also rejects Claim 7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himeshima et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Jones et al. (US 6,069,443). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 15

The Examiner also rejects Claim 15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himeshima et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Tamano et al. (US 5,968,675). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claim 23 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 23 in a manner similar to that discussed above for independent Claim 1.

Koyama does not disclose or suggest the features of amended Claim 23. For example, Claim 23 recites that an angle of an interface between the photosensitive organic resin film and the light-emitting layer to the anode sequentially varies. In

contrast, in Koyama, any such angle varies discontinuously (see e.g., in contrast, Fig. 3 in the present application and numerals 44a and 44b in Fig. 11 of Koyama).

Therefore, Koyama does not disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 23, and Claim 23 is patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. As a RCE is also being submitted, it is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

In addition, Applicants submitted IDSs on March 31, 2006 (received by PTO on April 3, 2006) and March 7, 2006 (received by PTO on March 13, 2006) but have not received initialed 1449 forms from the Examiner showing that the references in these IDSs have been considered. As a RCE is being submitted herewith, it is respectfully requested that these IDSs now be entered and considered, prior to the issuance of any further action on this application, and that initialed 1449 forms accompany the next action.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment or RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 18, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568